

**From:** "Dave Shelton" <ds@tahoedesigns.com>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/14/2005 6:46:32 PM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek

Ken,

I attended the public hearing last week at NTHS. I believe my only comment would be a request that any improvements proposed include a buffer from any existing development. I envision both a physical buffer, perhaps 100 feet or so, and a visual buffer. I think that should apply to any improvement including parking lots, defined trails and roadways, and buildings. I own adjoining property and I believe most of the adjoining property owners never anticipated any development of the state lands. I understand the right to develop and I hope not to be a nimby, but hopefully increased public access to this area can be accomplished with minimal impact on the neighbors.

Dave Shelton  
1225 North Lake Blvd.

30.0

**From:** "Jim Zellers" <jim\_zellers@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/12/2005 7:11:03 PM  
**Subject:** Public comment

Ken,

I don't really have the time to do a research project on the proposed Burton Creek state park expansion but I do have a few comments on what I have read.

31.0 1. The purpose of this proposal is to, "...provide high quality recreation..." "...with splendid views..." "...clear streams..." Well, we already have that. I can bike, ski, and hike there anytime I wish and I drink out of those streams constantly (against State Park's advice), because the water is so clean and clear already. Why do I need the state park to spend my money which they don't have enough of, being in constant deficit spending and all, to provide me with something I already have?

Ken, I really want a specific answer to that question.

31.1 2. What happens when the state park is overrun with visitors in peak months and the state parks decides it needs another bathroom and closes the park for the season to build one with an outside contractor, while it loses revenues. You guys have a bad track record here looking at the Donner State Park model and I am not confident state parks will be any more efficient with Burton Creek. Sure you can provide all kinds of stipulations and mitigations, but once the park is approved, history has shown us over and over State Parks runs the show and the local community bears the inconvenience of an approved money pit.

31.2 3. The general plan states how they will manage the area in much detail. Is the USFS currently falling behind in their management practices? Can't we just all help them to keep it in its natural state and save several million dollars which we don't have anyway.

31.3 4. Traffic impacts seem to be a large component of the proposal. Wouldn't the money set for this proposed park be better spent on a transit system like that in Mammoth, CA., Aspen, CO., Steamboat, CO., Vail, CO., etc. A free system with stops every 15 to 20 minutes so cars are less of an issue at the Lake.

31.4 5. I just don't get the benefit for us locals.

Thanks-

Jim Zellers  
Truckee, CA  
25 year resident  
530.587.2081

**From:** "Rankin" <rankin@sierra.net>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/11/2005 10:13:13 PM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek Park-Tahoe City

Dear Mr. Andersen,

32.0

We are year round residents of the Highlands subdivision in Tahoe City, adjacent to the proposed campground that is being considered in Burton Creek State Park. The notification of a public hearing came to us too late to be there in person to tell you of our dissatisfaction with this plan.

32.1

We feel that it is imperative that all action be stopped so that you can get the true picture of what is at stake. Traffic congestion is a huge problem already and adding more cars to this area is unconscionable! What happened to the resolution made by supervisor Mr. John Knott (Calif. State Parks newsletter #6, 2002) in support of a passive recreation facility?

32.2

32.3

The number of proposed campsites, cars and RV's coming through the one and only artery into this subdivision, will hugely impact this neighborhood as well as Highway 28 that feeds into it. Any traffic control specialist will tell you how truly bad this traffic problem is for this area, especially in the summer season. A developer is building a new subdivision at the entrance to this neighborhood which will add a large number of more cars, plus there is a plan for a recreation center building that may come in the future, and this will also add to the traffic. Increased traffic also adds to the danger in case of a forest fire. The people in the proposed campground would be at great risk.

32.4

In addition to the traffic issue there is also another issue that should be considered. Burton Creek State Park is presently a very nice, pristine area that is easily accessible to both locals and vacationing visitors. This is an area that should be preserved not disturbed. The plan that is currently being considered would ruin this area. It would add to pollution, it would be detrimental to the wildlife, and it would take away one of the main attractions that is a reason people come to vacation in this area!

Please revisit this subject and scale down this plan to a passive recreation facility or move it elsewhere!

Frustrated and angry,

Greg and Mary Margaret Rankin

3185 Fabian Way

Tahoe City, Ca. 96145

530-581-2030

**From:** "Rankin" <rankin@sierra.net>  
**To:** "Ken Anderson" <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/12/2005 9:22:36 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Burton Creek Park-Tahoe City

Mr. Anderson,

32.5

Thank you for your reply. Please add this response to the official record of the final document.  
If the access road is by the Tamarack Lodge, the issues we brought up still apply. If that is the only way in or out then the danger in a fire situation would be very great. It would cause a lot of traffic congestion with RV's as well as cars trying to flee a fire. That would also create a dangerous intersection. On busy summer days the back up now often extends to Tamarack Lodge or to Lake Forest Road, and with the additional cars that a campground will add, the backup could easily extend to the top of Dollar Hill! Imagine this with a forest fire happening and emergency vehicles trying to get to the fire. Also, a campground in that area would our opinion add to the possibility of a fire. From just a safety point of view, the current plan is a bad idea and should revert back to the passive recreation facility plan that was formally agreed upon!

Greg R Rankin & Mary Margaret Rankin  
3185 Fabian Way  
P O Box 5803  
Tahoe City, Ca 96145  
email: rankin@sierra.net

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Anderson [mailto:kande@parks.ca.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:41 AM  
To: rankin@sierra.net  
Subject: Re: Burton Creek Park-Tahoe City

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Rankin,

Your letter will become part of the official record of the final document along with the department's response. I can tell you if you read the current draft plan you will see that the proposed access route does not go anywhere near the Highlands now. Also, notices went out about the public meeting three weeks in advance of the meeting. I am sorry you were unable to attend. Please review the final draft when it comes out for responses to the rest of your comments. Thank you for your letter. Ken Anderson

>>> "Rankin" <rankin@sierra.net> 7/11/2005 10:12:33 PM >>>  
Dear Mr. Andersen,

We are year round residents of the Highlands subdivision in Tahoe City, adjacent to the proposed campground that is being considered in Burton Creek State Park. The notification of a public hearing came to us too late to be there in person to tell you of our dissatisfaction with this plan.

**From:** <annegreenwood@sbcglobal.net>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/18/2005 7:32:56 AM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek development

Good morning,

We live in Dollar Point and use the proposed area on a daily basis year round. We run, hike, and cycle in the spring, summer, and fall, and we nordic ski in the winter. We love the access to this lovely area, but also realize the benefits of a managed area.

I view the development as a positive one given several factors are addressed:

1.) We love the nordic center for our own personal benefit, but also for what it provides the community; a strong center for children, adults, and tourists to develop the skills and passion for the nordic sport. They are really a stellar local business. We are most fearful that their business would be jeopardized by the development of the park.

2.) The traffic is unbearable at this point. Further usage seems unmanageable.

There is quite a strong local sentiment against this development. I've heard several people express fears that access will be severely restricted for mtn. biking etc.. Is this true or hysteria? I, for one, envision more people using the area in an orderly fashion and exploring this natural treasure in a respectful way. I think we need more camping resources, especially in North Tahoe.

Thanks for your time.  
Anne Greenwood

33.0

33.1

33.2



**From:** "John E. Hearst" <jehearst@berkeley.edu>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/11/2005 10:50:21 AM

Sir:

34.0

34.1

34.2

I oppose the State Park plan to put 170 camp sites in the Burton Creek State Park area. The traffic through Tahoe City in the summertime is rapidly destroying it as a productive target for vacationers and home owners, with development moving to the Truckee Area. The original plan to build a by-pass road distant from the lake-front must be the first step in any plans for increase land utilization in the Tahoe City area.

John Hearst  
3020 Polaris Road  
Tahoe City

John E. Hearst, PhD, DSc  
Professor Emeritus  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720-1480

office: (510) 642-3556  
mobile: (510) 407-4555

jehearst@berkeley.edu  
jehearst@lbl.gov

**From:** "Ray Garland" <ray.garland@mail.com>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/11/2005 10:36:03 AM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek Draft General Plan

35.0

As a homeowner at 3165 Cedarwood Drive, I strongly urge that the State Park Department adhere to its earlier position that met with the approval of area residents; i.e., that it be for passive recreation only. The revised plan presented July 7 will be a traffic disaster for an already crowded region.

Ray Garland

**From:** "H W Kenyon" <hwkenyon@pacbell.net>  
**To:** "Ken Anderson" <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/10/2005 9:17:59 PM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek State Park Plan

Ken Anderson

Dear Sir,

When did the plan for Burton Creek change from passive recreation to transient campsites, complete with new roads, support facilities and overnight winter camping?

Where is the traffic study that justifies adding another turnout for slow moving campers at the already dangerous Dollar Hill summit intersection. Vehicles enter Highway 28 just below the crest of Dollar Hill from both North and South and accelerate from the top of the hill westbound, making this a tricky intersection even for locals.

Has the state considered that the Firestone property is slated for development with a proposed senior housing and a recreation center adding to the traffic?

The chart of your proposal indicates that Dollar Hill property may be co-opted into Burton creek and that a proposed Admin Building may be constructed 400 yards from Dollar Reservoir, with proposed access through a residential area backing the Nordic center.

I question if this is the best use of resources. Dollar reservoir is a quiet place used by locals, the closest pond to residential housing in that area. Residents should not be treated to transients in their back yard and campers deserve more of a wilderness experience.

The alternate entrance should be closer to town and the campsites if there are to be some, located in western Burton Creek only. The speed limits are slower for town making crossing Highway 28 safer for cars and pedestrians. Supplies and shopping are within walking distance. Parking, emergency medical facilities and law enforcement are close at hand. Burton pond and creek are a short hike in.

Some people have said that the camping industry will be good for business in town.

I doubt is any number of campers will give Tahoe City the economic shot it needs. Sugar Pine Point is a great park but it hasn't done much for Tahoma.

Sincerely,

Hugo Kenyon  
Tahoe City

CC: "virginia graham" <v-graham@sbcglobal.net>

36.0

36.1

36.2

36.3



**From:** "Joann Russell" <joann.r@earthlink.net>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/10/2005 4:05:23 PM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek S.P. General Plan meeting comments July 7 2005

My comments regarding the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan:

37.0

If your traffic survey indicates that traffic from your planned 200 campsites and large group campsite will not improve to an LOS D after CalTrans improvements, what happens to the BCSP plan? If traffic from BCSP will cause the traffic to remain at or revert to LOS F, does the gridlock justify invoking the "unavoidable significant environmental effect"?

37.1

Your statement that 50 to 80% of homes are second homes does not appear to take into account rentals which raise the total occupancy rate. In the Highlands - the closest housing development to the Dollar Property, the local owner/occupancy is 62%. The 2000 Census showed the total occupancy at 85 %.

37.2

On p.33, you state: "The Department believes the proposed day use facilities will lead to improving some of the indicators for the TRPA thresholds and help solve transportation problems in the area." I find it hard to believe that creating up to 200 campsites and a large group campsite, with all the traffic those would generate could possibly help solve transportation problems.

37.3

On p.36, you intimate that campers will have "splendid views" of mountains and the Lake Tahoe Basin from the areas of "active and passive...recreation". This might be a serious overstatement. Perhaps it could be worded more realistically.

37.4

The residents of the Highlands are not likely to launch a coordinated effort to oppose the campground development - providing the access to the campgrounds is located at Tamarack Rd. However, there is sure to be strong opposition to any location of the access road from the top of Dollar Hill with the road traversing the Dollar Property north of the Highlands. I would hope that State Parks will not wait another 3 years before we hear of progress toward the culmination of the BCSP plan.

Joann Russell  
jayjo@thegrid.net

**From:** "Emily Headley" <ehedley@inreach.com>  
**To:** <kande@parks.ca.gov>  
**Date:** 7/9/2005 9:44:00 AM  
**Subject:** Burton Creek State Park

Dear Mr. Anderson:

38.0

38.1

I am writing to express my support for improving Burton Creek State Park for passive recreation without bringing unacceptable levels of new traffic to the Tahoe City area. The current proposal under consideration, for the development of approximately 170 camp sites, would significantly detract from the wilderness experience that is now enjoyed by both residents and visitors to the area. Additionally, the impact of another 300+ vehicles, as a result of developed campsites, would make our current traffic problem even worse.

Please do not pursue the general plan for creating the campsites. Please stick with the passive recreation plan for Burton Creek.

Thank you,

Emily Headley

Emily Headley R.D.

P.O. Box 7272

Tahoe City, CA 96145

530/581-5640

530/581-0240 fax